

1 John V. Picone III, Bar No. 187226  
2 jpicone@hopkinscarley.com  
3 Gary H. Ritchey, Bar No. 136209  
4 gritchey@hopkinscarley.com  
5 Jennifer S. Coleman, Bar No. 213210  
6 jcoleman@hopkinscarley.com  
HOPKINS & CARLEY  
A Law Corporation  
The Letitia Building  
70 South First Street  
San Jose, CA 95113-2406

7 ***mailing address:***  
8 P.O. Box 1469  
9 San Jose, CA 95109-1469  
Telephone: (408) 286-9800  
Facsimile: (408) 998-4790

10 Attorneys for Defendant  
11 CHECKPOINT TECHNOLOGIES, LLC

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
14 DCG SYSTEMS, INC., CASE NO. CV 11 3792 PSG  
15 Plaintiff,  
16 v.  
17 CHECKPOINT TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,  
18 Defendant.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-2, 7-12, and 16-2(e), this Stipulation for Defendant  
 2 Checkpoint Technologies, LLC, to continue the Case Management Conference (the "Stipulation")  
 3 is made by and between Defendant Checkpoint Technologies, LLC ("Checkpoint"), and Plaintiff  
 4 DCG Systems, Inc. ("DCG"). The purpose of continuing the CMC is to allow the parties an  
 5 opportunity to meet and confer between the time Checkpoint's answer is filed and the date on  
 6 which the case management statement is due (see Order Setting Initial Case management  
 7 Conference And ADR Deadlines filed in the above-captioned matter on August 2, 2011 ("CMC  
 8 Order")).

9 DCG's Complaint was filed and served on August 2, 2011. Checkpoint's answer to the  
 10 Complaint is currently due August 23, 2011 and a Case Management Conference ("CMC") is  
 11 scheduled for October 18, 2011. The CMC Order sets forth the following dates and deadlines  
 12 that flow from the date of the CMC: September 27, 2011 (the last day to meet and confer re initial  
 13 disclosures, etc.), and October 11, 2011 (the last day to file Rule 26(f) Report, etc).

14 DCG and Checkpoint's counsel have agreed, pursuant to a separate stipulation, to extend  
 15 the deadline by which Checkpoint must file a responsive pleading to the Complaint up to and  
 16 including October 7, 2011. Should the CMC remain as currently scheduled, the September 27,  
 17 2011 deadline requiring the parties to meet and confer regarding: i) initial disclosures; ii) early  
 18 settlement; iii) ADR process selection; iv) discovery plan; v) file an ADR Certification; and  
 19 vi) file either a Stipulation to ADR Process or Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference would  
 20 occur prior to Checkpoint's filing of a responsive pleading to the Complaint. In order to give  
 21 counsel for both parties adequate time to prepare for the deadlines that must be met pursuant to  
 22 the CMC Order, counsel have stipulated to continue the CMC to November 1, 2011, and request  
 23 that the Court grant this requested continuance pursuant to United States District Court, Northern

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 District Local Rule 16-2(e). Counsel for the parties do not anticipate that the continuance of the  
2 CMC will have any effect with respect to scheduling other dates and deadlines for the case.

3 Dated: August 15, 2011

HOPKINS & CARLEY  
A Law Corporation

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

By: /s/ John V. Picone III

John V. Picone III  
Attorneys for Defendant  
CHECKPOINT TECHNOLOGIES, LLC

Dated: August 15, 2011

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

By: /s/ Mark E. Miller

Mark E. Miller  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
DCG SYSTEMS, INC.

**ORDER**

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 19, 2011

  
THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
PAUL S. GREWAL